

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,323,439 to Kambe et al.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is improper and therefore should be withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 5-7 remain pending for further consideration with claim 1-4 and 8-9 being withdrawn from consideration.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kambe et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 5, Applicants respectfully submit that Kambe et al. does not teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least a feature of “a conductor layer formed on an exposed surface of the filling material in the plated through-hole.”

The Office Action alleges that Kambe et al. clearly teaches each and every feature of the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, the Office Action appears to suggest surface wiring layers 32 and 51 of Kambe et al. as the claimed “conductor layer.” In the present invention, as shown in FIG. 1, a conductor layer 6 is formed on an exposed surface of the filling material 5 of a plated through-hole 4. By contrast, in Kambe et al., as shown in FIG. 1, the surface wiring layers 32 and 51 are merely formed on insulating resin layers 21 and 22,

respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that Kambe et al. neither teaches nor suggests that the surface wiring layers 32 and 51 may be modified to be formed on an exposed surface of the filling material of any via holes H1-H6. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that Kambe et al. fails to disclose the claimed combination including at least the feature of “a conductor layer formed on an exposed surface of the filling material in the plated through-hole,” as recited by independent claim 5.

In addition, Kambe et al., as described in col. 11, lines 21-23 for example, merely discloses that the filling material is an epoxy resin. Applicants respectfully submit that Kambe et al. neither teaches nor suggests the claimed “filling material according to claim 1” including the curing agent that is a dicyandiamide curing agent.

For at least the reasons as those discussed above, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of independent claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because Kambe et al. does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 5. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Thus, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).” Furthermore, Applicant respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 6 and 7 should also be withdrawn at least because of their dependencies upon independent claim 5 and for the reasons set forth above.

With no other rejections pending, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5-7 are in condition for allowance.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP

By: 
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: June 2, 2005

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Tel 202.739.3000
Fax 202.739.3001